UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes, *Editor in Chief*

Associate Editors

Francis Neilson | Louis L. Mann | Curtis W. Reese

What Is A Liberal?

By EDMUND B. CHAFFEE

Gandhi's Dream

By HARIDAS T. MUZUMDAR

What Price Naval Disarmament?

(Concluded)

By BRENT DOW ALLINSON

Easter Greeting, Nineteen Hundred and Five

By JENKIN LLOYD JONES

VOLUME CV | NUMBER 8

Chicago, April 21, 1930

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

(Established 1878)

A JOURNAL *of the* RELIGION *of* DEMOCRACY

Subscription, $3.00 Per Annum

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, EDITOR IN CHIEF

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

FRANCIS NEILSON LOUIS L. MANN CURTIS W. REESE

UNITY Fellowship

EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Managing Editor

EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE

Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER

IN

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

SYDNEY COLLYER, Chicago. WM. C. GANNETT, St. Paul.
JENKIN LL. JONES, Janesville. C. W. WENDTE, Cincinnati.
J. C. LEARNED, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.

Per Year, $1.00. Single Number, 10 Cents.

FRANCIS L. ROBBINS, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. SUNDERLAND, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
GEO. W. COOKE, Grand Haven, Mich., - } "Notes and News."

Editorial Contributors

W. Waldemar W. Argow
Charles E. Beals
Percy M. Dawson
David Starr Jordan
Anna Garlin Spencer
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
James H. West

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—Charles Strong
AUSTRIA—Stefan Zweig
BULGARIA—P. M. Matthéeff
ENGLAND—Harrison Brown, Fred Hankinson, Walter Walsh
CANADA—Norman Stewart Dowd
FRANCE—G. Demartial, Romain Rolland
GERMANY—Theodor Hahn
INDIA—Rabindranath Tagore
ITALY—Dorothy Walton
JAPAN—Nobuichiro Imaoka
PALESTINE—Hans Kohn
RUSSIA—Alina Huebsch

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, October 12, 1929, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

SPECIAL!

A Series of Nineteen Brief Essays

entitled

"PARABLES OF WAR AND PEACE"

by

John Haynes Holmes
Editor-in-Chief of Unity

These Parables have been written by Mr. Holmes at odd times since the close of the Great War. They are meant to represent in symbolic or narrative form the basic truths of the absurdity and horror of war and of the blessing of peace. Each Parable deals imaginatively with one specific aspect of the subject.

This special series will be published in successive numbers of Unity beginning with the issue for April 7.

Subscribe Now $3.00 Per Year

Unity Publishing Company
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page

Notes 115
What Is a Liberal?—EDMUND B. CHAFFEE.... 118
Jottings—J. H. H..... 120

ARTICLES—

Easter Greeting, 1905—JENKIN LLOYD JONES.. 115
Parables of War and Peace—III. For Slaughter—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES..... 120
Gandhi's Dream—HARIDAS T. MUZUMDAR.... 121
What Price Naval Disarmament?—II. The Lost Stake of American Diplomacy (Concluded)—BRENT DOW ALLINSON..... 121

POETRY—

A Meditation for Easter—VICTOR E. SOUTHWORTH 125

THE STUDY TABLE—

Faces of the Dead—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES... 124

CORRESPONDENCE—

Mr. Levinson on the Court—S. O. LEVINSON.. 126
"Appalling Information"—LUCIA AMES MEAD 126
Science and Theism—Truth Seeker..... 126

THE FIELD—

Community Service Committee Report to the Community Church of New York..... 127

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOLUME CV | MONDAY, APRIL 21, 1930 | NUMBER 8

Greeting to the Builders and Friends of Abraham Lincoln Centre

Being asked for an Easter message as from a far country, I greet you from the table-lands of Anno Domini, one thousand nine hundred and thirty.

I hark back to the time when together we builded the Lincoln Centre. In the light of the quarter of a century that has passed since, with trembling hearts and tear-brimmed eyes, we took possession of its newly dedicated walls, we now see how exaggerated were our fears, how inadequate were our hopes. These few years have rebuked our over-anxiety for things and justified our trust in ideas, however halting and half hearted.

What a comfort the little we gave so long ago has been and is to us; what a disappointment and oftentimes what a disgrace has been the much we withheld. We called the withholding "saving," but that we saved is all gone now. It no longer is ours, and some of it has become a menace to the peace and power of those who call it theirs, except in so far as it has been illuminated by and devoted to the spirit that inspired the higher investments represented by the Lincoln Centre. But that we gave is still ours.

We still rejoice with increasing joy in the solidity of the walls we reared, to which the growing vines lend year by year increasing grace. The facade that erst was pronounced "grim," now shines with the gratitude of lonely ones who within find warmth in cold days, and light in dark hours. The walls are now made lovely by the love of little children; by the manliness they have engendered in wayward boys; by the nobler ambitions they have awakened in the hearts of young fathers and mothers; by the devoutness of the aged; the comfort they have been to widows and orphans; the civic righteousness they have encouraged; the municipal advancement they have furthered, and the love of humanity they have inspired.

Dear friends, do you ask me from where I send to you this message? I cannot tell; I do not now know, any more than I did twenty-five years ago, where lies the boundary line between time and eternity, or whither flows the stream we used to call the "River of Death." I do not seem to know on which side of the stream I now am, if stream there be.

I am only sure of this,—that most of you are where I am, and that there is now, as then, but one company; that there is no hither or farther side. Adjectives of space and direction do not apply. We now realize what I then preached,—that time and space mark not the abode of the blessed nor the place of the damned. I am sure also that we all now regret the dallying, the halting that so shortened our working hours, compelling us to leave so many things undone that were dear to our hearts, clear to our minds, and fitted to our hands.

Now as then, our state of being is best expressed in terms of thought, of love, and evermore of action; now as then, our life is hid with the Christ of the soul, with the saviours of history, in God. How true it is that "Whether we live or whether we die, we are the Lord's!"

The quarter of a century that has sped since we consecrated with song and prayer the Lincoln Centre to the well-being of humanity, is but a tick of the clock that marks the rise and fall of man-made schemes, while the unceasing, unfailing, unchanging realities of truth, righteousness, and love remain unchanged and unchangeable. These still make new and glad, now as then, here as elsewhere, the Easter hopes which invite us and the dear ones that are hastening after us, to rest in the eternal realities.

In, of, and by these realities, I subscribe myself forever and aye

Your friend and pastor,

Easter, 1905.

Jenkin Lloyd Jones

[Twenty-five years ago, Jenkin Lloyd Jones wrote this Easter Message to his people as from the year 1930. We take joy in reprinting this Message on this exact date for it has a beauty and significance which belongs to all time and to workers for peace and brotherhood everywhere. What Mr. Jones said about his cherished institution, Abraham Lincoln Centre, may be accepted as an ideal for all institutions that are serving the public weal. May this message, spoken now as Mr. Jones anticipated from the world of the spirit, come to us as an inspiration to new uplift and dedication.—Editor.]

The use of the veto power is usually the supreme test of a president. Mr. Hoover will soon be meeting this test under conditions as dramatic as though deliberately conceived by a master playwright. In all probability within a few days of one another two bills will be laid upon the President's desk for approval. One will be the notorious, noxious, nauseous tariff bill. A veto should fall upon this bill so quickly as to paralyze the Congress which has insulted the intelligence of the nation and betrayed the public interest in enacting a measure which robs the people more brazenly than ever a gang of train robbers robbed a group of travelers. The other bill will be the Muscle Shoals bill, sponsored by the great Senator Norris, establishing a decent measure of public ownership and operation of the enormous source of natural wealth

involved. What private money interests have been doing to secure control of Muscle Shoals has fortunately been revealed in elaborate detail. We have the makings here of a scandal as expensive to the people, if not actually as disgraceful to the government, as the famous Teapot Dome affair. Senator Norris' bill represents statesmanship of a high order, and the only safe and just solution of the problem. It should be signed. Yet we have a fear that President Hoover, with his known opposition to the policy of public ownership, will follow the Coolidge example and veto this measure. This will be too bad, for we can think of nothing that would so quickly restore the shaken foundations of the Hoover administration as approval of the Muscle Shoals bill, except only disapproval of the tariff bill. It is our belief that Herbert Hoover would become the most popular president since Roosevelt if he took right action in these two cases.

It gives one pause now and then to think of what is going on in Asia and Africa. India has issued her Declaration of Independence and raised her national flag. China is cancelling one by one her treaties of extra-territoriality, and thus establishing herself as master in her own household. A Filipino delegation is in Washington, with a better chance of securing independence for their islands than has existed at any time since the era of "benevolent assimilation." All the Arab world is aflame with insistent demands for an independent Moslem world. Egypt is free, and has recently elected a parliament of nationalists. Ethiopia has sent a minister to England. "The myth of the divine overlordship of Europe over the colored world," writes Dr. W. E. Burghardt Du Bois, in the *Crisis*, "is beginning to fade." It is, indeed! The War marked the definite passing of Europe as the center of the world's life. America now succeeds to the place of primacy, and will remain there, in all probability, for a century, perhaps several centuries. Time is slow! But inevitably, as civilization moved west from Syria and Greece to Rome, then north and west from Rome to Germany, France and England, then west again to America, so is it destined to stride still west to Asia and Africa. Russia, as much Asiatic as European, is really a part of the Eastern renaissance, and must share with China and India the hegemony of the future. What an age in which to live! It is as though the globe were suddenly being tipped, and all relations upset. Or is it rather a process which we see at work here, like the movement of the stars? Whether revolution or evolution, it is *change*—and all in favor of those peoples which have been so long lying in subjection to the white man. "Westward the course of empire takes its way."

The Shaw report on the riots in Palestine last summer is the weak report of a weak Commission. In its painful endeavor to distribute blame and exculpation as evenly as possible among the parties concerned, it brings chief satisfaction to the Arabs who, as the aggressors in the disturbances, had most to fear from an impartial and rigorous statement of the facts. The injustice to the Jews is manifest on a dozen counts. Why stress Jewish immigration as one of the basic causes of Arab hostility? For years the flood of Jewish immigration poured into the land without arousing Arab fears. In 1925, nearly 34,000 Jews entered the country without disturbance. Since then, thanks to the arbitrary action of the Mandatory, immigration has been cut down to almost nothing, and is no longer a factor in the problem of Jewish-Arab relations. The Commission talks about the land problem, and the fear of the Arabs of being disinherited. The Commission should know that this charge is ridiculous. There is room in Palestine today for twice the present population; on the coastal region alone, as Dr. Weizmann has pointed out, there is room for not less than 20,000 Jewish families, without displacing a single Arab; at the very point where friction would most naturally develop, on the land itself, Jewish and Arab laborers are living and working happily side by side. As for the Commission's quite gratuitous suggestion that Jewish immigration has been largely motivated by political rather than economic motives, nothing could be farther from the truth. Surely the Commission could not have visited the Jewish settlements, as we did a year ago, and seen what the *Chaluzim* are doing. These pioneers are concerned with no politics of Zionism or anything else. They are impatient of such politics. They are dedicated to reclaiming the land, for themselves and for their Arab neighbors, and have neither time nor strength for agitation. It is grossly unfair that the Commission should so slander the colonists of Zion.

Bad as the Shaw report is, especially from the Jewish standpoint, it yet has its value. Thus, in its more or less unconscious revelation of the indifference and incompetence of the English administration in the face of a critical situation, the Commission presents the most damning indictment of the Mandatory yet seen. We quote on this point from the New York *Times:*

"The chief impression one carries away from the report is of an extraordinary lack of ability, or lack of concern, on the part of the British authorities. A situation admittedly difficult was allowed to develop to the point of crisis. With plenty of tinder and powder lying about in Palestine, no effort was seemingly made to discourage the scattering of sparks by mischief makers or fanatics on both sides.

"To say that there are fundamental causes for Arab-Jewish hostility does not mean that these causes cannot be removed by peaceful methods. It certainly does not mean that the explosion of last Summer was inevitable. What happened was that tension between Arab and Jew was permitted to increase and no measures were taken to guard against the menace to public order. The Shaw commission finds that the intelligence service in Palestine was inadequate, that the Palestine police—with

the exception of the British members of the force—was not to be depended upon, and that the policy of reducing the military garrison in Palestine and Transjordania 'was carried too far.' In other words, the Palestine Government was in no position to know when and where trouble was brewing, or to deal with it in its early stages by police measures, or to make a display of military force in case of developments on the scale actually attained."

But the report does not limit itself to the English authorities actually on the ground. It goes behind them to Britain itself and its action under the Balfour Declaration. The Commission is here severe in its indictment, but not severe enough, nor fundamental enough. For it is not merely that the British Mandatory has given no clear interpretation of the Declaration, and thus has left Jews and Arabs in a state of uncertainty which it could not or would not clarify. This judgment is sound as far as it goes, and the Commission quite rightly calls for consistent, clear-cut, and courageous policy on this central issue. But deeper down is the fact, apparently not mentioned by the Commission, that the Mandatory from the beginning has been wrestling with conflicting promises made to Jews and Arabs during the War for war purposes. These promises could not be and, therefore, have not been fulfilled, with the result of grievances on both sides which finally exploded last August at the instigation primarily of Arab agitators. Until the situation created by the War is cleared up, the Palestine problem will remain unsolved.

Everybody agrees that Prohibition has done one good thing. It has abolished the saloon. Even though it has failed, and may continue to fail, in all else, it has at least succeeded here. But it is our belief that there is a second great achievement which must be placed to the credit of the 18th Amendment. We refer to the fact that it is destroying the two old political parties. As it has wiped out the saloon, so it is now wiping out the Democrats and the Republicans. Look at "the historic party of Jefferson and Jackson," for example! One-half of this party is in the South, which is as "dry" as a last year's cornstalk. The other half of the party is in the great cities of the North, which are as "wet" as a Mississippi flood. The row over Mr. Raskob, chairman (as this is written!) of the Democratic National Committee, is a perfect illustration of how Prohibition has split the Democrats into two wings, which can no more fly together than the wing of a hawk and the wing of a barnyard fowl. But the Democrats are no worse off in this regard than the Republicans. The Grand Old Party is officially "dry." President Hoover's administration is solemnly committed to the support and the enforcement of the 18th Amendment. Yet such historic strongholds of the Party as Massachusetts, New York, and New Jersey are in open rebellion against the "dry" regime. This issue is cutting right across the two political machines, just the way the slavery issue cut across the political machines in the '50s of the last century. In the case of slavery, the Whig Party was destroyed, and the Democratic Party was so completely wrecked that it was out of office for a generation. It is not unlikely —nay, on the contrary, it seems to us exceedingly likely—that the same thing is going to happen today in the case of liquor. If so, the Prohibition cause is abundantly justified. To destroy in the space of a decade two such evils as the saloon and the bi-partisan combine is enough glory for any one reform movement. Though nothing else were ever to be achieved by the famous Amendment, we would be well content.

It still remains as true as ever that it takes "distance" to "lend enchantment." For example! On March 6th last there were some Communist demonstrations in this country. One of the largest was in New York. Peaceful and undisturbed for some two hours or more of fiery speech-making, this New York demonstration was broken up by the police when the Communists undertook to march from Union Square to City Hall without a permit. Twenty minutes of vigorous pushing, chasing and clubbing dispersed the throng. The scene was disgraceful in its brutality, but from the police standpoint entirely successful. An account of this affair appeared in the *Rote Fahne* of Berlin, and this was the way it read:

"After the mass meeting, the workers in powerfully closed ranks marched, completely unmindful of the ban of the police authorities, towards the City Hall. The front ranks of the police cadres were broken at once. Undaunted, the masses rolled forward and onward. In front of the City Hall the demonstrators were met by an army of 25,000 police in full fighting military array. The demonstrators would not budge. As the police opened fire from machine guns in the streets and from the roofs, an embittered man-to-man fight ensued and lasted late into the evening. The New York Police Commissioner, personally in charge of the massacre, was surrounded by the demonstrators and beaten till he bled. With great difficulty a shock regiment of police saved him. The bourgeois press asserts: 'Never before has New York lived through such a battle.'"

One has to live in Berlin to get facts about America like this! In the same way one has to live in New York to get facts of the same kind about Berlin, or Moscow, or Ahmedabad in India. The dispatch quoted above is not only entertaining, but also enormously useful as showing what newspaper propaganda is when it gets far enough away from home. Just such stuff as this which was fed to the Berliners, and undoubtedly believed by most of them, has been fed to us for years out of Russia, and is now being fed to us out of India. There is no believing what is told in the newspapers about distant events which involve prejudices, passions and the fate of nations. One must rigorously cultivate an alert skepticism, and wait patiently for the truth which hobbles along at last if it be given time enough.

What Is a Liberal?

In our controversies, religious or political, three words stand out. These three words are Radical, Conservative and Liberal. It will help us in our consideration of any question to understand them. These three words describe three points of view, three main attitudes which thinking men may assume towards vital problems.

As far as we have any records of men, down through the ages, in Egypt, in Babylon, in India, in Greece, in Rome, in western Europe and in America, they have divided into three main types. There have been in every age and clime those who have wished at all costs to hold on to the old, to walk in the ancient paths, to do as had been done. These are the Conservatives. Again, there have always been a few who have rebelled against the old, who have wanted to get off the beaten path, who have wanted to do as had not been done. These are the Radicals. But there has been still another class—men who have wished to hold on to some of the old, to walk sometimes in new paths, to do some things as they had been done, but to find new ways for others. These men we call Liberals. To put it in another way, the Conservative is a man unwilling to change. The Radical is a man anxious to change. The Liberal is a man willing to change, but not anxious to do so. The Conservative is for what is. The Liberal is partly for and partly against. The Conservative says, "the old is best." The Radical says, "the new is best." The Liberal says, "the best is found in both the old and new."

We find all three in the pages of history. In the days of the Hebrew monarchy, Baal worship grew in power. The nobles and kings deserted the God who had heard the cry of the slaves in Egypt and they made the lot of the common people hard and hopeless. In this period of unfaithfulness and injustice, there was a small sect who would have nothing to do with the new civilization in Canaan. These said—"Let us return to the old, free life of the desert. Let us live as we did before we settled in Canaan." The preachers of this doctrine were called Nazarites. But there was another group who said "Away with oppression of the poor by the rich. Our God is not merely the God of the Desert. He is the God of the Promised Land as well. Let us reform our land, not leave it." These were the prophets. Now the kings and nobles and all those who upheld things as they were, were the Conservatives of that day. The Nazarites who said "Get out of the whole mess" were the Radicals. The prophets, who said "Adapt ourselves to new conditions—reform the country," were the Liberals.

Again in our own land in 1776 there were those who believed the colonies should remain loyal to England at all costs. These Tories, as they were called, were the Conservatives. There were others who said, like Patrick Henry—"Give me liberty or give me death," "Break with England and take the consequences." These were the Radicals. There were still others, and our historians are now telling us that they were in the overwhelming majority (except that they did not overwhelm) who were opposed to England's policies, but had no desire to break with her. These were the Liberals.

In 1860 we had a large group of people who said "Slavery is lawful. It is right. It must remain." These were the Conservatives. There were others who said, "It is never right. It is a curse. It must go." These were the Radicals. There were still others who said, "It is bad, but it cannot go just yet. We must use care." These were the Liberals. Possibly Stephen Douglas may represent to us the Conservative, William Lloyd Garrison, the Radical, and Abraham Lincoln, the Liberal.

In the field of politics, as the war came on in our own land in the great campaign of 1916, Hughes, who stood to defend things as they were, was the Conservative. Wilson, who was feeling his way, was the Liberal, and Debs, who solidly opposed all war, was the Radical. In the field of religion a few years ago, it would have been fair to say that Dr. Straton, of the Calvary Baptist Church was the Conservative, Dr. Potter, of the Unitarian Church, was the Radical, and Dr. Parks, of St. Bartholomews Church, the Liberal.

When we turn to nations, we find that just like people, they, too, have points of view. They may be classed as we have been classing people. For example, Russia is a radical nation. It is trying the new. It is anxious to do what has not been done. China is conservative. It wishes, in the main, to do only what has been done, although this national viewpoint is changing. It wishes to follow the ways of the past. England, especially today, with a Labor Government, is a liberal nation. It is trying some of the new, but is holding on to much of the old. One nation may exhibit these types within itself in different periods of its history. For instance, the United States at its inception was radical. It rapidly became liberal. In general we were liberal until up to about the Spanish-American War. From then on, a change set in, so that today we would rank as a great conservative nation.

Once more let us look at it in this way. Take two or three questions and note the attitude of each type of mind to them. Take the question of our calendar. Any scientist will tell you, and we all know, that it is far from perfect. Our years are not quite the proper length. We have to make an awkward adjustment every few years. Our months are uneven. No one knows just why we should have them so variable

in their number of days. A number of suggestions are put forward, among them a plan which provides 13 months of 28 days each, each date of each month always coming on the same day of the week. The extra day of the year, the 365th, is made a holiday, and a complete reform, satisfactory alike to business and science is arrived at. Now the Conservative says, "What—change the months to 13? Give up the leap year? Give up the old rhymes about 30 days hath September? Never." Your Radical says, "Sure, away with the old calendar. It's worn out. Get a new one." Your Liberal says, "Yes, the old calendar is none too good, but are you sure you have a better one? If you have, prove it to me. If you can prove it, I'm with you."

Or again, take the question of our present economic system. The Conservative says, "This is the wisest and best system men have ever had. Hang on to it. Don't disturb it. Don't rock the boat. Men are better clothed, better fed, better housed, than ever before in history. Don't change." The Radical says, "What a horrible system this capitalist system is. The millions toil and have not. The few toil not and have. An economic system of more injustice, more greed, more heartlessness, cannot be imagined. Change it. You can't make it worse." The Liberal says, "A plague on both your houses. I see that this machine civilization is feeding and caring for more people than ever before in the world's history, but I also see that there are great moral costs. I believe we can make some changes while leaving much that now is. Possibly tax land values more, provide more liberty of speech, have more municipal ownership—a hundred and one reforms suggested."

Or once again in the field of religion. The Conservative holds on to what he has been taught. His religion is that which has come down to him by tradition. He resents any change in doctrine or form. The Radical, however, says religion is generally superstition. There is no such thing as a personal God or a future life. He rejects or is liable to reject most of the faith of his fellowmen. The Liberal says, "You are both right and you are both wrong. Man is undeniably religious. He can no more escape religion than he can escape breathing. Yet he must avoid superstition and he must not forego his reason. He must have a religion which will really make for individual and social progress."

From all this, we see that the illustrations are endless. There are these three main points of view, which show themselves in all questions. Indeed, one man may show the three in himself. He may be radical in one field, conservative in another and liberal in another. One may play several parts, but essentially the Conservative is the man whose mind is closed to the new, the Radical is a man whose mind is dead to the old. The Liberal is a man whose mind is open to both the old and the new.

The Liberal, then, is the man whose mind is open to both the old and the new. What are the virtues of a Liberal? We will name three. He is, first of all, a real truth-seeker. He is ready to take the truth, no matter where he finds it. He brings the scientific attitude to his problems. He is willing to grant that the fact of men's having done a thing in a certain way is some evidence that it is a good way, but he is also ready to look for a better. Yet he will not discard the old until he sees that the new is a better way.

In the second place, the Liberal is tolerant. He does not ridicule other men's opinions when they are sincerely held. He does not pretend to have a corner on truth. He will listen respectfully to both the Radical and the Conservative, hoping that he may learn from them. He does not try to excommunicate others, either in the political or religious field. All he asks is that Radicals and Conservatives grant him the same liberty which he is willing to grant them. The Liberal strives to be fair to all and impatient with none.

In the third place, the true Liberal is willing and able to co-operate. He is willing to compromise on matters of personality, though not on matters of principle. But he does not define co-operation, as "your working with me in my way." He is willing to work with others in the way that seems best to the group. Briefly, we would say that the Liberal is a real truth-seeker, and willing to follow that truth, no matter where it leads. He is tolerant of the opinions of others, as he wishes others to be tolerant of his. He is willing and anxious to co-operate with his fellows. Such are his principal virtues.

And his vices are these. He is apt to be lacking in zeal and enthusiasm. Just because he is a middle-of-the-road man, his propositions and proposals are not as clear-cut as the Radical's and the Conservative's. He sees too much truth to see a simple solution. He cannot burn with a fanatic's zeal. In times of great crisis, he cannot take one idea and follow it relentlessly. Quite frequently he must follow the Radical or give up hope of his reform. He is neither cold nor hot, and as John wrote to the Church at Laodicea—"Because thou are neither hot nor cold, I will spew thee out of my mouth." The Liberal is sane and temperate, so sane and temperate that he finds great difficulty in giving the sledge hammer blows which some great walls of prejudice and injustice must receive. The Liberal is apt not to have zeal in himself or the quality of evoking it in others.

And his second vice springs from this. He receives the kicks of both Conservatives and Radicals.

He pleases neither. Under this constant criticism, it is hard for him to maintain his position. He is in what the physicists call the state of unstable equilibrium. One of two things is liable to happen—either he becomes a Radical, or a Conservative. Moreover, while he can co-operate with others, yet a group of Liberals generally speaking do not have the driving power of a group of Radicals or Conservatives. Liberals can see too far and too clearly. They are always conscious of the fact that there is much to be said on both sides. The Liberal is apt not to be a hard hitter.

And yet, appraising them all, the Radicals, the Conservatives and the Liberals, the man who loves his fellows will wish for an evergrowing body of Liberals. We need some Conservatives, although Heaven knows the market is oversupplied today, to hold fast the gains of the past. We need a few Radicals, probably quite a number more, to keep society from perishing of hardening of the arteries. But we need more the liberal mind, always open to the truth, always tolerant, working steadily and surely to bring a better day. We need the liberalism of Jesus, who said, "I came not to destroy the law, but to fulfill," but who also said, "A new commandment give I unto you—that ye love one another."

EDMUND B. CHAFFEE.

Jottings

On April 6th last the thirteenth anniversary of the entrance of the United States into the World war was celebrated in Washington. On this same day it was announced by the government that our participation in the War had cost us to date $51,400,000,000. We wonder what Washington was celebrating!

The Boston *Herald,* referring to the recent war literature of the "All Quiet On the Western Front" type, fears that we are on the verge of a "peace hysteria" as bad as the war fever of thirteen years ago. Too bad! *Too bad!!* Some physicians fear in much the same way that people are getting too healthy.

It is not surprising, perhaps, that the word "influence" springs from the same root as the word "affluence." The two words belong together at least in the sense that a man who has the latter is pretty certain also to have the former.

The right to work is as basic as the right to live. The two things should be interchangeable in the sense that no man should live without working, and no man should work without living. In this proposition is the whole of the law and the gospel of economic justice.

Mr. H. L. Mencken, in his new book, "Treatise on the Gods," says of Martin Luther that he was "cocksure, dictatorial, grasping, self-indulgent, vulgar and ignorant." Curious—these are just the epithets we would apply to Mr. Mencken. Yet Mencken is no Luther!

The newspapers have had great fun sneering at Gandhi's little band of followers on his march from Ahmedabad to the sea. The band was small, but not so small as the band that followed a certain Jew named Jesus on a certain march to Jerusalem, and that band overthrew an empire.

J. H. H.

Parables of War and Peace

III
For Slaughter

The cattle went by my house as usual that morning. I heard, as I heard every day, an hour or so before high noon, the shuffling of the many feet and the shrill cries of the drivers; noted, as I noted every day, the drifting cloud of dust; and knew, as I knew every day, that another melancholy caravan had gone the way of death.

This day, however, as I sat at table, I heard a second drove go by. There was the same shuffling of many feet, the same sharp cries, and there, out of the window, the same drifting cloud of dust.

"Some more cattle today," I queried.

"No," said my wife, "it's the soldier boys. They march by here once in a while, you know!"

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

Gandhi's Dream*

Torn by conflicting desires, pulled by different ideas, I became deeply absorbed in thoughts of the Civil Resistance campaign against the Salt Tax. The Mahatma is to be the Commander of this first battalion of six and sixty strong. Should I make the sixty-seventh? To court imprisonment deliberately—is that the best use I can make of my American training in social sciences? Cannot I be of greater service to the cause of India's freedom by remaining outside prison bars and creating public opinion at home and abroad through the agency of the press and the platform? On the other hand, what availeth my being his admirer and biographer if I cannot embrace the first opportunity to identify myself with the greatest and the last of the Mahatma's movements?

I fell into a trance while I was debating these problems.

They march, they march onward—this battalion of seven and sixty. Days pass like hours. The faces of these non-violent soldiers are beaming with joy. Now their commander tells them a good joke and all burst forth into laughter; now he tells them of the sufferings and ordeals they will have to go through.

They march, they march onward—this battalion of hundred, all womenfolk from the Ashram (Gandhi's Colony: Sabarmati Ashram).

They march, they march onward—these thousands of battalions from the North and the South, from the East and the West. They march singing songs of India's Freedom. Rich and poor, manufacturer and farmer, employer and employe, men and women—all, all march joyously through town and country, by mud houses and palatial structures. The greatest battle of human history is being fought. The soul force of a great people is matched against the brute force of a mighty empire.

These men and women are conscientious objectors: they object to the salt tax, they object to the enormous land tax, they object to the "satanic" character of the British governmental machinery in India. They swell the prisons to overflowing—and now they are free men and women spiritually, though physically they are imprisoned.

They march, they march onward—the farmers of famed Bardoli. Indeed, the whole of Gujarat is mobilized, city-folk as well as village-folk.

The flag of freedom is unfurled all over India. The Bengalees are marching bare-headed as if to perform the funeral ceremonies of a fallen empire. The Punjab Hindus and Mohammedans are vying with one another to furnish their quota to the army of Free India. The Madrasees are busy checking up the records and documents of the government that is no more.

Life and property are safe; happiness and contentment reign supreme among the masses. The police officers who direct the traffic in cities are educated, dignified, courteous fellows well-versed in their duties. The American and the European and the Japanese are briskly moving about in the centres of population, conducting their commercial transactions with the Indian merchants in a manner mutually satisfactory to both.

The landscape is beautiful. A mantle of green vegetation and verdure is spread all over the land. The fields are smiling with rich crops. And lo! a busy population is engaged in erecting monuments to the generation that freed India from the yoke of foreign rule. This is the fifteenth year since the United States of India, welding together the Indian States and the Provinces of former British India, was born.

The free citizens of the United States of India look back with pride upon the non-violent battalions that moved up and down the country beginning with the 12th of March, 1930; they—

A knock at the door roused me from my trance. . . . My decision is made up.

HARIDAS T. MUZUMDAR.

Sabarmati Ashram
March 7th, 1930

*The author of this article is one of the band of men who followed Gandhi on his historic march to the sea. Author of "Gandhi the Apostle," ten years a resident of this country, Mr. Muzumdar returned to India last fall. Earlier articles from his pen have appeared in UNITY. —Editor.

What Price Naval Disarmament?

II.

The Lost Stake of American Diplomacy

There have been two principal undertakings designed to promote the solution of the pressing international problem of security since the World War—the League of Nations, which began as a clique of victors to guarantee their prizes and exactions, and which is moving through force of logic and events towards an European economic federation and a political equilibrating-machine, with important educational and financial features, vis-a-vis, Soviet Russia and the mysteriously disturbing Russian center of gravity outside the known planetary system—and the League's International Court of Justice, or jurisprudence, at the Hague. Although very closely concerned with the birth of both, as godfather and, indeed, progenitor, American diplomacy has not yet been moved to affiliate the nation officially and legally with either the one or the other. For this, as for everything, there is a reason, a profound reason, which is not always evident even to those who argue most persuasively about these high and complex enterprises of international policy and prudence.

One of the profound reasons for American refusal and reluctance is the shocked recoil of American opinion from the reality of the War when it was at last unmasked by the character of its conclusion. In that historic fact, however, tragic was the long misconception which preceded it, there is enduring encouragement. Another and less evident reason is the existence of a sharp conflict between what may be termed the Wilsonian theorem of the League of Nations, which closely resembles the French view, and the historic facts of American political thought and

national orientation. The former, like the interesting White Paper issued by the British Foreign Office in explanation of its signature of the "optional clause" of the Hague Court's statute, envisages the termination, henceforth and forever, of neutrality, and of all specifically neutral rights and duties, as a principle and practice of positive international law and polity. "There can be no neutrals in the future!" exclaimed Mr. Wilson on his way to the peace conference at Paris, in a flash of sudden illumination. Therefore, there is no problem of the Freedom of the Seas, as announced in the fourth of his Mosaic Fourteen Points, to discuss with the British or the other naval powers. . . . "As between members of the League (and, constructively, it was assumed, of the Kellogg-Briand Pact renouncing war), there can be no neutral rights because there can be no neutrals," declared the communiqué of the British Government shortly before the opening of the London Naval Conference, although there is no word directly or indirectly referring to the problem or principle of neutrality in the language of the celebrated treaty. Obviously, if there is never to be another war there will never be another non-combatant to exercise a neutral's rights. It is all as clear as a syllogism—as clear and as fallacious. . . . The dissolution in defeat of the great Conference of London demonstrates the fallacy of the logic, as applied to contemporary and historical facts, with which creative statesmanship must deal in a spirit of non-academic compromise between the past and the future, the frustrating present and the ideal.

The Wilsonian theorem is the accepted doctrine of the League of Nations. It was first enthusiastically supported in the United States by persons who believe in the "realistic" efficacy of international agencies of compulsion, in the practical possibility of maintaining peace by overawing collusions of force—often very loosely called "international police power," or, more frequently, "sanctions" authorized by a sovereign political council. Indeed, the movement of opinion here, sharply diverging from the spirit of American institutions, first crystallized, it may be remembered, in the "League to Enforce Peace," sponsored by Chief Justice Taft and President Lowell, of Harvard, on the eve of "Woodrow Wilson's War." That theorem was and is opposed, with the silent force of gravity, by almost the whole bearing of traditional and idealistic American thought and political feeling, and characteristically and vehemently by one of the principal originators of the germinating idea of the Treaty for the Renunciation of War—Mr. Salmon O. Levinson, of Chicago, who is now engaged in "thinking out loud," and formulating, a series of radical moral, political and legal corollaries of the Pact, alternative measures to military coercions very different from the sanctions of public violence, which he calls the "sanctions of peace."

The Wilsonian theorem was, and is, equally opposed by Senator Borah, whose forthcoming utterances on the "World Court" controversy will, we venture to think, startle many of its friends, and ours, who have taken too much for granted. He has already declared with unmistakable emphasis that "if the Kellogg Pact means (as assumed at London) that henceforth there shall be no neutrals it necessarily follows that we and all the other signatories become belligerents. Under these circumstances, the Pact is misnamed; it is not a peace pact, it is a war pact." Thus the contest over the implementation of the Kellogg-Briand pact, now in progress in certain American circles, when reduced to essentials, is seen to be closely analogous to the historic struggle over American ratification of the Treaty of Versailles and participation in the League of Nations. . . . Even so does history repeat itself under new guises; and American opinion divides again today on the same fundamental issue which sundered it in 1920, and in 1917. The present senatorial battle in Illinois reverberates it.

The Hoover Administration has taken no stand for the Wilsonian Theorem, or against it. It has, on the one hand, cut directly athwart it by the President's sensational, and very important, proposal of revising the law of nations to the end of rendering food-ships of neutral states immune from seizure or deflection in time of war. The underlying philosophy of this envisages the continuation of positive form of neutrality, to the end of sanctioning peace, mitigating the horrors of war, and refusing to collaborate in imposing the last, full measure of violence—starvation—even in the name of peace and of "sanctions" when authorized by the League. The Secretary of State, moreover, thought it desirable to issue a formal statement, in December last, repudiating any obligation on the part of the United States to collaborate with other powers in the enforcement of the Pact of Paris, and declaring that the statement of the British White Paper concerning the non-existence of neutrals in the future concerned, evidently, only members of the League of Nations, and could not be interpreted as applying to the United States. In so doing, Mr. Stimson voiced the traditional and the popular American view of the moral independence of the United States from the treaty-entanglements of Europe; indeed, he but echoed the significant declaration of the Foreign Relations Committee to the United States Senate on the occasion of its ratification of the Kellogg-Briand Pact, in December, 1928. That declaration, it may be recalled, ran as follows:

"The Committee further understands that the Treaty does not provide sanctions, express or implied. Should any signatory to it . . . violate its terms, there is no obligation or commitment, express or implied, upon the part of any of the other signers to engage in punitive or coercive measures as against the nation violating it. The effect of violation of the Treaty is to relieve the other signers from any obligation under it with the nation thus violating it.

In other words, the Treaty does not, either expressly or impliedly, contemplate the use of force or coercive measures for its enforcement against any nation violating it. It is a voluntary pledge upon the part of each nation that it will not have recourse to war."

Why did the Secretary of State echo this "isolationist" sentiment shortly before his departure for the great naval conference? The point is of capital importance in the discussions now proceeding in London designed "to put teeth in the Pact," and requiring of the United States by every indication, some political or ultimate military guarantee in return for the naval disarmament which it seeks. Was it because he had reason to fear that, *in exactly the same way as President Wilson found himself compelled to "purchase" his League of Nations, and its intercalation with the Treaty of Versailles, at Paris, in 1919, by yielding to the cupidity and political vindictiveness of the Allied*

leaders, despite their prior pledges of acceptance of the Fourteen Points, various crucial demands at the expense of justice to the vanquished nations, so the Hoover Administration would now be asked to yield political and even military guarantees, in return for international naval disarmament, and even, perhaps, for "parity" with Britain—despite the theoretical prior concessions of the British Government—at the expense of the ethical content of the Peace Pact, as understood in the United States, and of the liberty of action of future American administrations faced with any serious threat to international peace? It is essential that the American people should understand this, in order to frame an answer to the pressing question: *What price disarmament?*—and to apprehend the true reason why the great London Conference as a whole, and American diplomacy in particular, again confronts failure when success appeared to be within its grasp. . . . Verily, the echoes of 1920 are in the air!

If the American people be as unwilling today as they were a decade ago to underwrite the existing political arrangements and territorial integrities of Europe (cf. Article 10 of the League Covenant), and if Europe, particularly France, has in no sense abated its demand for such guarantee as the price of disarmament—if, in a word, there has been no increase of understanding between America and the dominant group of Europe—the outlook for success at London or at any other international conference designed to effect security by the consolidations of superior force is well-nigh hopeless. But, one may hope or believe, there has been a change; and that change is incorporated in the Kellogg Pact, which certainly ought to have indicated to the political arbiters of Europe the level upon which, if not the degree to which, American co-operation in the maintenance of peace may be gained. It ought to be entirely clear, if it is not, to ourselves and others that *such co-operation is to be had henceforth upon the moral, the economic and the judicial—but not upon the political and military planes.* . . . Such is the great political lesson of the War and its aftermath. The American people will not willingly repeat their *political* or military intervention in the shifting affairs, the entanglements and collisions of Europe. One tragic blunder is enough. Washington speaks louder than Wilson and all his political pragmatists today.

On the other hand, it may be observed, the same Hoover Administration which has proposed the repudiation of starvation and the hunger-blockade as an instrument of any kind of war—and thereby indicated its desire to reconsider the whole subject of the rights of neutrals in the light of the moral obligations involved in the renunciation of war has, in signing the World Court protocol, indicated its abandonment of moral isolationism and announced its willingness to subscribe at least to the *legal system* of the League of Nations, with certain important reservations. It appears, indeed, that it has consented even to submit the Kellogg-Briand Treaty itself—since no reservation touches it—to interpretation by the Hague Court as to its meaning, if such should be asked of it. One may justly conclude, therefore, that the great historical issue of 1920 has been revived; and politically "straddled" by the present Administration in its search for peace—so long, at least, as it may be argued that the Hague Court remains in any respect subject to the legislation of the League, and the war-treaties; or so long as it lacks an adequate and affirmative international *Corpus Juris* built upon the rock of the categorical renunication of war as an instrument of policy, and defended by the sanctions of peace.

In this connection some words of the noted philosopher of war, the General Carl von Clausewitz, writing before the death of Napoleon, may be recalled. "War," said he, "is but a continuation of political intercourse, with a mixture of other means. . . . It is by no means an independent thing in itself. Accordingly, war can never be separated from political intercourse. Is it not merely another kind of writing and language for political thoughts? It has certainly a grammar of its own, but its logic is not peculiar to itself. . . . If in the consideration of the matter, war should ever be separated from political intercourse, all the threads of its different relations are to a certain extent broken, and *we should have before us a senseless thing without an object.* War is no such consistent thing tending to an extreme, as it should be according to the abstract idea, but a half and half thing, a contradiction in itself; as such it cannot follow its own laws, but must be looked upon as a part of another whole—and that whole is policy." We may realize from this how far we have come, and in what constructively revolutionary direction we are moving in the modern world. And, in no small measure, by the initiative of the consistent American minority.

Even so, it is by no means clear, even in theory, that, in annulling the ancient right of war and in separating it from public policy—and thus terminating the "international anarchy," which the Peace Pact seeks to do, and ostensibly does—it is not clear that the rights and duties of neutrality, i. e. of states not obligated to take overt measures to enter or to suppress a war, must entirely disappear. That they must suffer change and revaluation cannot be doubted. It may even be granted that no signatory nation of the Pact can henceforth remain indifferent to a threat of war, or to any state of hostilities growing out of some injustice, whether "justified" or not. Granted that it may *not* turn such a calamity to irresponsible profit by asserting any right to indiscriminate sale of munitions and supplies, as did the United States during the period of its benevolent neutrality to the Allies, prior to its participation in the World War as a belligerent. *It still remains a debatable question as to how, and how far, neutrality is to be modified in favor of collaboration in measures of coercion or repression, and as to whether non-violent or juridicial means of redress are open.* If the law of nations is silent, or if the international courts for any reason are closed against *a nation, or a political group not yet recognized, perhaps, as a state—even if it commit some act of technical aggression it may not be in the wrong; and it may not be in the interest of justice, liberty or humanity that it should be boycotted or starved and outlawed by the world, or by a few powers who will impose their will as "sanctions," in the name of the world and of Peace.* This is the important difficulty, and the eventuality which proponents of the Wilsonian theorem and of the sanction-theory of the League fail, by some curious myopia, to envisage. Yet a moment's reflection concerning what would have happened, for example, if France had been a member of the League of Nations in 1780, and as such obligated to impose "sanctions" of force *against* the revolting American colonies, which had no legal right to assert their po-

litical liberty or demand by force of arms and war the redress of their grievances. . . . Indeed, we escaped the menace of a Holy Alliance once by the questionable means of the Monroe Doctrine. Let us hope that we shall not be obliged to do so again, and to repudiate a solemn treaty into the bargain!

Peace is not equivalent to maintenance of the status quo. It is a condition that may exist only where the means of change and of growth in a changing, growing world are possible without violence. Peace is the natural result of an ordered society instinct with liberty and justice. Where justice is denied in policy, liberty will revolt in search of peace. Such is the structure of the world. It is the first business of wisdom and of true statesmanship to observe it. It appears, then, that upon some middle ground, some happy synthesis of the "irreconcilable" positions of America and Europe, and not on the hills of pride or intransigence peace and a peace-building statesmanship must find its victories. Even as the League of Nations has already been profoundly modified by American policy and American statesmanship, the United States being *in absentia* from Geneva, so the current "European" theory of security through political or naval guaranties, and of peace by the hypothetical application of sanctions of violence, may, and indeed must be renounced in favor of the non-violent principles of co-operation and assent to change, if neutrality is to be renounced in favor of new sanctions of peace, and if America is ever to be persuaded to collaborate in the realistic maintenance of international peace without renouncing its own moral and political and historic integrity.

What, then, is the compensation offered America for the great renunciation of its historic faith and defense of non-combatant rights and liberties which is now impending? It *must* be non-violent sanctions, policies of economic fair-dealing and political justice, and far-reaching disarmaments on sea, land, and in the air. . . . A new code of sea-law built upon the Pact of Peace and achieved by open discussion and assent—this is the first pre-requisite of progress and the principal stake of American diplomacy at London, or after the failure of London. Dare we hope that other powers will understand it if we, the people of the United States, and particularly our Senate, falter in doing so?

The problem is one for jurists and statesmen, not for statisticians and journalists. "Where the leaders are blind, the people perish." Peace is not possible without a sharing of responsibility. And foreign policy will not be safe without the guidance of modernized law. The revision of the existing code of neutral rights and duties is the first pre-requisite of naval disarmament, even as the joint guarantee by the naval powers of the sanctity of food-ships and the inviolability of the sea-lanes of communication *to all non-belligerent states,* i. e., to all states abiding by the law of peace and honoring their signatures to the peace pact, is the *conditio sine qua non* of disarmaments on land and in the air. The next step, therefore, is the summoning to the long-delayed third (Hague) international conference, of representatives of all the states members of the Peace System, *including Soviet Russia,* for elaboration of the detailed naval code of peace built upon the Pact, and for stipulation of the legal obligations of each member, obligated according to position and power, to take such an such measures in collaboration for the common defense peace. These measures need not be violent. They need not exceed the character of embargo or cessation of intercourse. Their execution should be conditioned upon authorization *by a court,* not by a political council. . . . There will be no progress towards peace, no reconciliation of the American distrust of power-politics, and the European distrust of piosity, or sentimentality, until the problem is faced realistically by the American people and until the issue is joined and threshed out upon the juridical, not the physical, floor. Such is the task before us.

BRENT DOW ALLINSON.

The Study Table

Faces of the Dead

Death masks have always had a peculiar fascination for me. I hope that this is not due to morbid curiosity. I think it is due to a sincere admiration for great men, and a reverence for the dignity of death. The moment when life becomes extinct within the body, or as the soul takes departure from the flesh, is a moment of mystic awe. It leaves its stamp upon the face and the mask catches and preserves it for posterity.

In this book* are gathered photographs of more than a hundred death masks. The plates are accompanied by notes telling something of the famous dead whose faces are thus preserved, and explaining the circumstances under which the masks were made, and where these masks are now to be found. There is an introductory essay on the history of the death mask, and another on "How Death Masks Are Taken."

The plates are of solemn and august significance. The oldest mask here pictured is that of Bernardino Da Siena (1380-1444), the great Franciscan, which is immediately followed by the mask of Filippo Brunelleschi (1377-1446), the Florentine architect. The latest death mask is that of the late President Ebert (1871-1925), of Germany, which is immediately preceded by that of Lenin (1870-1924). Over all the masks is an amazing peace and quiet, as though death were not so hard. "The last breath is followed almost immediately by an unearthly smile," writes George Kolbe, in his account of how death masks are made. "To die seems thus a fulfilment, a consummation, the most exalted moment in life. . . . Whether death has come easily or painfully, . . . on every face is the smile of a soul released."

It is this fact, undoubtedly, which makes so many of these masks so beautiful. There is none so wonderful, perhaps, as Napoleon's, on which the editor quotes Heine's words, "Napoleon was not of the stuff that kings are made of—he was of the marble from

*"Undying Faces," by Ernst Benkard. Published by W. W. Norton & Co. $12.00.

which gods are hewn." Yet Moreau's face, crowned with its laurel wreath, is ineffably lovely, and Von Arnim's has classic outlines. Queen Louisa, dead at 34, has left a mask which shows all the beauty for which she was so renowned. Richard Wagner's mask seems to be life, not death, so animated and joyful it looks.

But not all these masks are thus attractive. On the contrary, there are not a few which come near to being horrible. This is especially true of the older masks, which obviously were taken either under bad conditions, or by crude artists. Beethoven's is here the most forbidding. Wasted by long and torturing illness, the master's face had fallen away almost to the skull, and shows nothing of the grandeur of that brooding countenance which held spell-bound his contemporaries. Schiller, so handsome in his virile manhood, has left only the wreck of his features behind. Richard Brinsley Sheridan's head is for all the world like that of an Egyptian mummy. Sir Walter Scott's face is tragic beyond words to describe. In this mask is all the suffering, physical and spiritual, of Scott's last years—no light but only heavy darkness as the curtain fell upon his drama.

Many of the death masks are disappointing in the sense that they show little of the power and greatness of the men whose lineaments they preserve. This is emphatically true of the masks of Sir Isaac Newton and Thomas Paine, which were obviously taken clumsily, or too late. It is also true of Jonathan Swift, and William Pitt, and Friedrich Nietzsche. But other masks tell eloquently their story. What rough, heroic strength in the mask of Cromwell, and what intellect in that of Lenin. As for Tolstoy, the death mask might be taken as the symbol of the ages' wisdom, or as the very face of deity.

But all these masks of the great and famous must yield place to the one mask of all the collection which bears no name. It is called simply "L'Inconnue de la Seine," and preserves the face of a young, sweet girl, whose body, found floating in the river Seine, was borne to the morgue, where the mask was made. The beauty of this face can be matched only by its pathos. That lovely brow, beneath the soft, smooth hair—those eyes, closed so peacefully in sleep—those cheeks, rounded in lines of perfect beauty—those lips, touched by that unearthly smile—and over all such peace, such quiet, such repose! Who was this girl? Why did she kill herself? How could death have been so sweet to one so young and beautiful? In this face is written the timeless tragedy of earth. If I were to affix to it a text, I should choose Kipling's prayer—"Mary, pity women!"

This volume is a thing of great and solemn interest. One can turn its pages for hours, and never tire. For it fronts one with the deep, deep mystery of death and with the equal mystery of life.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

A Meditation for Easter

We speak of the mortal and the immortal—
But it is nearer the truth to say, the selfish and the spiritual.

This is a thought not to be lightly set aside;
A theme deserving of our deepest consideration;
And as vital as any truth that can engage the human mind.

It will save us no end of confusion and groping in the dark once we have realized
That the selfish is not spiritual and that the spiritual is not selfish,
That between these two there is no middle ground.
That which is selfish is of its very nature mortal.
That which is spiritual is of its very nature immortal.

We have gone far astray from the way, the truth and the life
When with a mind centered upon our private and personal advantage
We cherish in our heart the selfish desire of attaining eternal ease and comfort.

Of all the great truths which we have inherited from the masters of spiritual understanding
This truth is the most vitalizing and invigorating—
Even though to our blind egotism it may seem bitter and hard—

Nothing exists for self.
All exists for all—
The unity of life for the unity of souls.
Deliverance from self is the goal to be attained.

We are repeating the greatest words of the most enlightened souls when we say:
That to which we cling as private and personal,
That which is of self and for self is subject to the ravages of time,
Is worn and wasted by the cares of life and comes at last to a merciful destruction.
Every illusion passes, but only the truth is eternal.

An infinite tenderness, an infinite wisdom and patience we need
If we are to speak with power the true word of immortality.

Only as the human mind is raised into the realm of universal love
Does our thinking approach the heights of spiritual understanding.
Only so can we even faintly apprehend the fullness and completeness
Of this world of beauty and truth to which we belong and of which from all eternity and to all eternity we are a living part.
This truth of immortality is to be realized in and through our self-surrender.
We are to remember that every reward of the spirit depends upon seeking no reward.
When our chief desire is for personal and private salvation,
Either in this or in any other world,
Our perception of truth is falsified and the light that is in us becomes darkness.
But when the soul is drawn away from self and toward the harmony of all in universal love
Our perceptions of truth are clarified.
As the light of the sun destroys darkness
So does the spirit of universal love destroy our doubts and fears;
And there dawns for us a new day—a day of rejoicing—our birthday into the world of spirit—
For we have learned to know that whatever truly is always was and always will be.

This everyday, matter-of-fact world in which we ordinarily exist
Becomes a world of bitterness and strife, a world of sorrow and pain,
Only because we have not yet learned
How utterly wasteful and unavailing are all human efforts
To build up and establish one's private and personal life

Apart from or in opposition to the common and universal life.
To the blinded multitudes this world becomes a hell of torment and despair
Only because the devil of selfishness has brought us into darkness and confusion.
This is the mortality from which we must escape.

We cannot share the immortality of universal love
Until we have learned to realize the unreality of the separate self.
This is for us the most difficult of all life's lessons—and the most beautiful:
To discover within the finite that which is infinite.

Attainment is ours, O Soul!
Divine attainment!
When we seek it for all.

VICTOR E. SOUTHWORTH

Correspondence

Mr. Levinson on the Court

Editor of UNITY: As is probably well known, I have from the very start opposed our entry into the league of nations and still oppose it. The league is a political body and, potentially at least, a military organization. The world court is a juridical institution and is now completely divorced from politics and force. I opposed our adherence until three things were done:

(a) The nations signed a general treaty outlawing war;

(b) Specific disavowal by the league of the right to execute decisions of the court by force;

(c) Making the consent of interested nations indispensable to a request by the league for an advisory opinion on "any dispute or question."

These things have all been done. The court sits 500 miles from Geneva; the league has no official or unofficial representative there. There is no compulsion either about submitting cases or enforcing decisions. In short, there is no world sovereignty and should be none.

Civilization has not been able to establish peace anywhere without the creation of courts of law and justice. The founders of our government both outlawed war between the states and clothed our federal Supreme court with jurisdiction to decide controversies between the sovereign states, but without power of enforcement. Thus for the first time in human history America established a court with jurisdiction over sovereign disputes. The nations of the world are merely following our example.

The Root formula is a literal restatement of the old fifth reservation plus a diplomatic method of finding out when we merely "claim" an interest what that interest is. It also gives us equal veto power with the other large nations over advisory opinions. It also provides for advance notice to us of a request for an advisory opinion, and not, as under the old fifth reservation, notice after the request has been made. The action of the jurists and the assembly last September goes far beyond both the old fifth reservation and the Root formula. By amendment of the statute and official declarations it does two things:

(1) Disavows the right of enforcement by war of the decisions of the court;

(2) Provides that the league will not request an advisory opinion unless the nations involved consent and that the court should not deliver an opinion unless both sides voluntarily and fully present their evidence and arguments.

The world court idea is fundamentally American and is indispensable to world peace. If we refuse to adhere we stigmatize our own peace pact under which we agree to use none but pacific means in our "disputes and conflicts." A judicial court is the greatest "pacific means" known to mankind.

S. O. LEVINSON

Chicago, Illinois.

"Appalling Information"

Editor of UNITY: These words, uttered by Mr. C. F. Weed, Vice-President of the National Bank of Boston, is his pronouncement on a revelation made from an investigation of the Boston Blue Book as concerns Boston charities. The Blue Book contains the names of the "Society" circle and well-to-do people of the city. This list was checked in comparison with the list of givers to 133 social welfare agencies in Boston and the "appalling information" disclosed was that 50 percent were not giving one dollar to these organizations. This startling fact was not first-page news with headlines, as it might well have been, displacing the news of the last banditry or prize-fight. Some of these, doubtless, if neglectful of home claims, might have given to Near East Relief, or answered other outside calls, but it is too likely that this is not true of most. Mr. Weed well says, "The charity that might blast out the other 50 percent will be doing a good turn for itself as well as for Boston."

It seems incredible that any privileged people with every comfort can be so shamefully deaf and blind to the needs of the poor, the sick, the aged, the unemployed, the foreigner, the ignorant and the embryo criminal in the great crowded city. One would at least expect that those whose expenditures go for their personal affairs and social indulgence would recognize the agencies that promote civic taste and a more beautiful city even if they have no interest in family welfare work and the prevention of cruelty to children and animals or societies for good government.

"To whom much is given, of him shall much be required." Schools, colleges and homes that have not made this consideration fundamental in education, have failed. There may be looming in the future a retribution for those who live on unearned increment, such as Russian princes met, who lived for generations ignoring the resentment of suffering people that was accumulating through the years. The retribution may not be so far-reaching and cruel, but it will startle those who have not learned what a decent self-respect and patriotism imply. Some wealth is won by the Edison and Ford type of man giving a *quid pro quo*; some by cornering natural resources like oil and becoming thus multimillionaires; or by owning vacant land which others move up to and make it worth $1,000 a foot. Is it not proper for the public to scan these varied sources of wealth and make its judgment, if none of it is given back to the community that has had a share in this creation? Our Boston banker has not spoken too loudly, nor too soon.

Boston, Massachusetts. LUCIA AMES MEAD

Science and Theism

Editor of UNITY:

As a long-time, serious reader of every article that appears in UNITY and as an admirer of the capacity of its editors to kindle light in dark places, I am somewhat disappointed in the general tone of the issue of March 8th. Pollyanna stuff, happily absent from your columns, has never appealed to me but is it not breath-taking when in your editorial you speak of the crumbling myth of belief in God? Just what kind of a God do you refer to? Are you sweeping every conception of God off the boards, even the theoretical and confusing one set up by the Humanists who apparently believe man to be God or god-like, though mortal?

You are alive to the epoch-making discoveries of science and well-equipped to interpret its theories, but it would please me, as a faithful reader, much better if before expressing your conclusions so summarily that there is no longer a God, if there ever was one, you would tell your readers the essential and indisputable facts that have come to light through scientific research and the proper inferences to be drawn from their revelations, remembering that they confine themselves to investigation of a materialistic universe and make no concessions out of that sphere for the benefit of non-scientists.

A resumé of what the noted philosophers have had to readjust in their systems and theories as a result of the latest science would also be tremendously provocative. Point out the inferences that any clear-headed person can draw for himself when the new book of science is opened before him. That would be a sermon no one could sleep through. Editors themselves naturally know so much more than the majority of their readers about what is going on that they are apt to think the readers have kept step with them. Often an editor takes a short cut to a decision and leaves his slow-paced reader perplexed.

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Community Service

Report to

The Annual Meeting of the Community Church of New York from the Community Service Committee

The Community Church of New York and Community Service

Conceiving the mission of the Community Church as concerned with all the varied personal and social activities which condition and embody the good life, its department of Community Service, during the five years of its development and within its resources, has been engaged with problems of health, recreation, mental hygiene, housing, sanitation, employment, race relations, crime prevention, birth control, development and control of public utilities, and the spiritual interrelation of communities.

The Policy and Program which these impulses inspire may be outlined in the following statement:

Policy

The Community Church differs from most other religious institutions in that it makes the whole and not a part or a phase of life the objective of its hopes and endeavors.

It does not recognize distinctions between the secular and the sacred.

It has no doctrine or program of individual salvation apart from the good society.

It seeks not to create a community or self-contained institution of its own, but rather provides a fellowship and medium through which citizens may discharge their resources of good will in the creation of the community of the common good.

The Department of Community Service is the Community Church facing outward toward the community at large. It supplies a medium through which men and women of good will are invited to coöperate in the common good without social discrimination, not even requiring or expecting that all such persons shall "join the Church."

It begins with the community's institutions as they exist by the will of the citizens, seeks to utilize them for the most efficient service of which they are capable, and where they are deficient, misdirected or abortive, joins with or generates social forces aiming to reconstruct or supplant such institutions. It reserves to itself no power to control other institutions for the institutional aggrandizement of the church.

It holds ear and heart open to approaches of all institutions and individuals in any manifestation of human need.

The experimental attitude controls throughout, involving error and failure at points, but insuring a vital approach to the problems of our ever-changing social order.

While its own program is meager, it aspires to render a distinctive service to modern society by setting forth this spirit and purpose as the sum and substance, the warp and woof of religion. A program thus inspired is deemed worthy to challenge the religious resources of the community.

In pursuance of policy set forth above the following is an

Outline of Program

for the Year 1930

Consultation Service

Our door is open to all inquirers seeking information or counsel on any matter where it is believed we can be of service. This service has prompted during the past year 900 visits from inquirers at the church and has demanded the assembling of information from an uncalculated number of sources. Inquiries show the widest range of interest, including many personal problems. Inquirers are referred to numerous public, semi-public and private institutions in the city designed to meet needs presented. Special counselors are enlisted for those requiring specialized service. These include sociologists, psychologists, physicians, lawyers, engineers, industrial and commercial leaders, and other technicians and professional workers. They allow us to draw upon their time and professional experience with a generosity most praiseworthy.

We begin thus with human interests in their simplest terms and take the stream of human experience as it comes without evasion or arbitrary selection. Accumulations of similar problems among individuals from time to time prompt group conferences and social projects.

Conferences

These are of great variety, touching the life of the community at many points. Some are arranged under auspices of the church. We participate in others organized under independent or institutional auspices.

In the past, conferences which we inaugurated have sometimes developed movements taken up under other auspices. Several have focalized upon relief of homeless men and women. These have modified certain organizations maintained by standard social agencies. Our conferences have furthered the several movements now in the field to cope with unemployment among older men and women who have been thrown out by mergers and other economic reorganization.

During the present season conferences will be inaugurated under the inspiration of the promotion groups mentioned below.

Health

During this season the program of health talks will be somewhat enlarged over past seasons, including among others, six Tuesday evening public meetings maintained with the coöperation of the Community Memorial Dispensary staff.

In addition, plans will be laid for a program of positive health, enlisting the coöperation of physiologists, psychologists and sanitarians. Further steps will be taken towards working out a program of periodic health examinations.

Active coöperation in promoting health on a broad scale is maintained with the following institutions in whose inauguration the Community Church has participated:

The Homestead

This is a summer conference and recreation center which has been maintained under a separate corporation for three seasons past. A broader program is contemplated for the summer season of 1930. Steps are now being taken to develop a more aggressive educational program with week-end Forum conferences, a young people's conference week and a Putnam County conference week. The two women's organizations of the church have been asked to take in hand respectively a project for the care of aged women or couples, and a summer program for mothers with small children.

Community Memorial Dispensary

A clinic is maintained, licensed by the State Board of Social Welfare, at 244 East 38th Street, corner of Second Avenue. Between 300 and 400 treatments are given each month. The work is supported by memberships, by special contributions and by nominal fees paid by the patients. With the coöperation of the Women's Auxiliary, an expansion is started during 1930 contemplating a small hospital and larger clinical service.

Mental Hygiene Clinic

The Community Church assisted with the inauguration of this clinic and contributes $1,000 per annum towards a total budget of $25,000. The clinic serves the A.I.C.P., The State Chari-

---

Tell us, if possible, whether the newest philosophy really interposes objections to the two questions—God and Immortality.

No sensible person wants to believe lies, no matter how much comfort he drew from them before he knew they were such. On the other hand the saying that the truth never hurts anyone is not quite the fact. The truth about God, Nature, Life, if it has now been found out, may for a time at least be a tremendous load to bear even for the stout-hearted. The old simile of the ship comes to me. If we are all passengers on a vessel fated never to reach port it is well to know this fact. We will do the best we can under the circumstances but unless we are wholly Spartan we are not going to enjoy the voyage.

Some persons there are who are indifferent to the question of personal survival but self-preservation being a law of nature, many are longing for another voyage after the present end, though the next be as tempestuous. Must that natural longing be rooted out of consciousness by a new form of education so that in due time all persons will be rid of the desire for a future life?

TRUTH SEEKER

[The writer of this letter evidently refers to the article on "Humanism" by Charles Francis Potter. We think it only fair to state that UNITY is not responsible for the opinions of its contributors or their statement thereof. We strive to grant to these contributors the same freedom we exercise ourselves.—Editor.]

ties Aid Association, and the Brooklyn Bureau of Charities, not being open to the general public. Cases are referred from the Community Church to the clinic through the A.I.C.P. We have at command the consultative service of Dr. Luehrs, the psychiatrist in charge, who frequently visits the church and is at constant call for consultation relative to individual cases. The largest service of the clinic is recognized to be the re-ordering of case-work methods in the three large welfare agencies which unite in maintaining the clinic.

Housing

In the past we have inaugurated and coöperated in numerous conferences dealing with this problem. We are members of the Advisory Housing Conference now organized as a section of the Welfare Council.

A coöperative housing project was brought to an advanced stage but proved abortive through difficulties in finance. Effort along this line is renewed during 1930 and other practical measures by way of advancing the cause of good housing will be taken, especially under the counsel of the Hon. John J. Murphy, member of the Committee.

Sanitation

Working in coöperation with the Kips Bay Neighborhood Association, effort maintained for four or five years will be continued through 1930. The Director at the Community Church is Chairman of a Committee of the Kips Bay Neighborhood Association, under which is organized a corps of women citizen block supervisors. This organization holds monthly meetings attended by the block supervisors and representatives of the city's departments of Street Cleaning, Health, Tenement House, Fire and Police. At these meetings larger questions of neighborhood and city policy are discussed and complaints of specific violations of city ordinances are reviewed for action by the city departments. In May of 1930 the Fourth Annual Dinner of this organization will be held, bringing together more than a hundred persons, including the women supervisors, selected members of the Street Cleaning force, members of the Kips Bay Neighborhood Council and city officers.

Through this organization connection has been maintained with other district and city-wide movements designed to redeem New York's scandal of unsightly and filthy streets.

Recreation

In addition to measures outlined under Health above, a project is being developed during 1930 by way of developing and using a comprehensive city recreation center for the benefit of the Community Church Fellowship and a wider public.

Promotion Groups

These are so called because they furnish the starting point of attack upon specific social problems. The groups are composed of not more than ten or fifteen persons selected for their known interest or skill in the fields covered. They meet once a month at a dinner. The aim is to lay out a platform on which the Community Church may stand in projecting concrete endeavors in the community.

When these endeavors result in practical measures, the project passes beyond the powers of these immediate groups and is taken up by institutions or organizations designed for the purpose. The four groups maintained during the present season deal with *Unemployment, Race Relations, Public Utilities* and *Crime.*

Good Will Court

Based upon experience in Brooklyn, the Good Will Court is ready for service at the Community Church. The coöperation of Mr. Sweedler and his associates at the Brooklyn Court is assured. A corps of "Judges" of highly qualified citizens has been enlisted. The Court is open to any who desire, under sympathetic counsel, to bring good will to bear upon their differences.

Community Church Relations

Our literature presents a standing invitation to those who desire counsel relative to any problem in which our experience or investigations may be desired. This starts considerable correspondence.

A series of booklets under the general title "Community Religion" includes four monographs already published. This series may be indefinitely extended, various topics being treated by numerous authors, specialists in their field. Experience shows that a supplementary fund must be secured if the plan is to be fully developed.

Financing the Program

As the above outline shows, large draft is made upon volunteer service. To make this and much other such service effective a salaried force must be employed. The salary of the Director is provided in the regular church budget as is also the expense of clerical service in the office.

It is proposed during 1930 that a supplementary budget shall be inaugurated providing for expansion along the lines indicated above and enlisting the support of generous persons in the community at large, irrespective of their membership in the Community Church.

—*The Community Church, 12 Park Avenue, New York City.*

"Any people anywhere being inclined and having the power, have the right to rise up and shake off an existing government which they deem unjust and tyrannical, and form a new one that suits them better. This is a most valuable, a most sacred right, a right which we hope and believe is to liberate the world."

—*Abraham Lincoln.*

The Oakland :: Press
GOOD PRINTING
Invitations, Announcements, Programs, Letter Circulars, Business and Personal Stationery, etc.
3913 COTTAGE GROVE AVE.
PHONE - ATLANTIC 1876

Phone Oakland 489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES
Everything in HARDWARE
AT
PORTER'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

Chateau de Bures
par Villennes, Seine-et-Oise
17 Miles from Paris, France
Country Boarding School
To Prepare Boys for American Colleges
30 Acres Own Farm
New Dormitories With Outdoor Sleeping Porches
Gymnasium. Athletic Fields
Modern, Progressive Methods
Music, Art, Sciences
English, French, and American Masters
For information address
Edwin Cornell Zavitz, Headmaster
Chateau de Bures, par Villennes, Seine-et-Oise, France

IN APRIL
Comes Easter as the signal for introducing your clothes of a new season. Spring demands an appropriate wardrobe—and there is no greater economy to be practiced than the use of our service which so expertly cleanses and freshens each previously worn garment that you send us.
Schumann & Co
Cleaners Dyers
PHONE DREXEL 0231 ALL DEPARTMENTS
MAIN OFFICE AND WORKS
3960 Cottage Grove Avenue

LIFT UP YOUR HEARTS
A Hundred Aspirations Towards Peace and Goodwill
By WALTER WALSH, D.D.
"The one hundred prayers gathered in this volume are infinitely precious."—*Unity.*
"Very beautifully expressed, phrased in golden words."—*The Inquirer.*
5s. net. Postage 4d.
WILLIAMS & NORGATE, 38 Gr. Ormond St., London, W. C. 1 England